

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 27-39 are pending in the application, with 1, 14, and 27 being the independent claims. Claims 15-26 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 14, and 27 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Support for these amendments may be found in the published application at paragraphs [0097], [0121], and [0159]-[0164], for example.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 10-14 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,600,744 to Carr *et al.* (hereinafter “Carr”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite generating a plurality of program modules, “wherein the program modules contain an operation code field and one or more operand fields” (emphasis added). In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite “generating a header, said header indicating whether one or more predefined fields are present in the data packet and identifying a location of said one or more predefined fields in the data packet when present, wherein the location is identified by an address value that defines the position of the one or more predefined fields within the data packet in terms of an exact position or in terms of a position plus an offset” (emphasis added).

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite “executing each of said plurality of program modules based on said operation code field” (emphasis added).

Carr does not teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1. Because Carr does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1, it cannot anticipate that claim. Dependent claims 4, 5, and 10-13 are also not anticipated by Carr for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 14, as amended herein, is directed to a method for classifying a data packet in a network interface that includes the feature generating a plurality of optimized program modules, “wherein the plurality of optimized program modules contain an operation code field and one or more operand fields” (emphasis added). In addition, claim 14 has been amended to recite “generating a header, said header indicating whether one or more predefined fields are present in the data packet and identifying a location of said one or more predefined fields in the data packet when present, wherein the location is identified by an address value that defines the position of the one or more predefined fields within the data packet in terms of an exact position or in terms of a position plus an offset” (emphasis added). Claim 14 has been further amended to recite “serially executing said plurality of program modules based on said operation code field” (emphasis added). As noted above in regard to claim 1, Carr does not teach or suggest at least these features. Therefore, Carr cannot anticipate claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 27, as amended herein, is directed to "a computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having computer program logic for enabling a processor in a network interface to classify a data packet." Claim 27 has been amended to recite second computer control logic means for enabling the processor to generate a plurality of program modules, "wherein the program modules contain an operation code field and one or more operand fields" (emphasis added). In addition, claim 27 has been amended to recite "fourth computer control logic means for enabling the processor to generate a header, said header indicating whether one or more predefined fields are present in the data packet and identifying a location of said one or more predefined fields of the data packet when present, wherein the location is identified by an address value that defines the position of the one or more predefined fields within the data packet in terms of an exact position or in terms of a position plus an offset" (emphasis added). Claim 27 has been further amended to recite "fifth computer control logic means for enabling the processor to execute each of said plurality of program modules based on said operation code field" (emphasis added). As noted above in regard to claim 1, Carr does not teach or suggest at least these features. Therefore, Carr cannot anticipate claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 6-9, 28 and 30-39

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 6-9, 16, 20-23, 28 and 30-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Synnestvedt.

Synnestvedt does not in any way remedy the deficiencies of Carr with respect to independent claims 1 and 27 as discussed above. Consequently, the combination of Carr and Synnestvedt cannot render independent claims 1 and 27 obvious. Claims 2 and 6-9 are not rendered the obvious by the combination of Carr and Synnestvedt for the same reason as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Claims 28 and 30-39 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Carr and Synnestvedt for the same reason as independent claim 27, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 6-9, 28 and 30-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 3

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Carr in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,884 to Connery *et al.* ("Connery").

Connery does not in any way remedy the deficiencies of Carr with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above. Consequently, the combination of Carr and Connery cannot render independent claim 1 obvious. Claim 3 is not rendered the obvious by the combination of Carr and Connery for the same reason as independent claim 1 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 29

The Examiner has rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Carr in view of Synnestvedt and further in view of Connery.

Neither Synnestvedt nor Connery in any way remedy the deficiencies of Carr with respect to independent claim 27 as discussed above. Consequently, the combination of Carr, Synnestvedt and Connery cannot render independent claims 27 obvious. Claim 29 is not rendered the obvious by the combination of Carr and Connery for the same reasons as independent claim 27 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 2/27/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1875 205.0 - Submission Under 1.114 in reply to Final OA dated 09/27/07.DOC